



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,852	12/15/2000	John C. Horton	RA5373	1674
27276	7590	10/30/2008		
UNISYS CORPORATION			EXAMINER	
UNISYS WAY			SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A	
MAIL STATION: E8-114				
BLUE BELL, PA 19424				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2454	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/738,852

Applicant(s)

HORTON ET AL.

Examiner

MOHAMMAD A. SIDDIQI

Art Unit

2454

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/11/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1, 3-11, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciarlante et al. (6,532,488) (Hereinafter Ciarlante) in view of Nishiyama et al. (5,859,977) (Hereinafter Nishiyama).

5. As per claim 1 and 13, Ciarlante discloses a System for assigning, each one of a plurality of versions of a software application (12, fig 1) to specific requests from specific users handled by a server comprising a processor and a memory (hosting system , 10, fig 1, col 3, lines 39-64), wherein more than one of said plurality of versions of a said software application is executing on said server and available to service requests from users on said server (ISV1-ISV3, 6, fig 1, col 3, lines 39-64), and wherein said specific users (8, fig 1) are provided access to said server by issuing requests to said server (10, fig 1), and wherein said requests have a SiteID (url, col 9, line 15) code in each said request (col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20), said system comprising:
a network listening program executing on the processor of said server (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64) for receiving said requests by said users for use of a said software application (App1, ISV1, fig 1) program (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20),

a table (10, fig 1) stored in the memory of said server (10, fig 1) containing correspondences between ones of a plurality of sites and ones of said SiteID codes (12, fig 1) said correspondences logically connecting a one of said more than one version of a said software application program to a one of said plurality of sites (12, fig 1) indicated by said SiteID code (url, col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20), wherein said one of said plurality of sites has only one of said more than one version of a said software application program and at least one data area (elements of Fig 1, col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20),

an access control manager program executing on the processor of said server for determining which one of said more than one version of a said software application program should service to each user request by reference to said table (col 10, lines 25-47),

a linking program executing on the processor of said server for passing each request (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64) to a respective one of said sites based on the determination by said access control manager so that the determined site processes the request and generates a response to the request (elements of Fig 1, col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

Although Ciarlante shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Ciarlante does not particularly point out an application hosting system (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20) host a plurality of versions of the same application software of the same vendor (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

Nonetheless this feature depends on the vendor of the software application provider, if

Art Unit: 2454

software application provider wants to host the different version of the same application on different server, the prior art provides the structure of servicing the access of the different application. Ciarlante fails to disclose plurality versions of a software application and accessing by SiteID, and table containing SiteID. However, Nishiyama shows a system a system maintenance and management of different version of the same application, and also provide details of site management functions with table containing SiteID (fig 3 and fig 14, col 7, line 42 to col 8, line 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the detailed teachings of site management of Nishiyama into the software application hosting system taught by Ciarlante to provide access to different copies of software application over a wide area network.

6. As per claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses wherein said access control manager program is part of said network listening program (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

7. As per claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses linking program is part of said network listening program (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

8. As per claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1,

Art Unit: 2454

above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses network listening program comprises a web server (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

9. As per claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses recording user information related to said each request (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

10. As per claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses auxiliary recording program supports billing programs that can bill for client usage of particular ones of said plurality of sites (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

11. As per claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Nishiyama discloses auxiliary recording program supports maintenance programs that improve server performance (col 7, lines 1-4).

12. As per claim 9, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses a linking program communicates requests and responses between a one of said plurality of sites and said client after a first request is handled by said network listener program (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

Art Unit: 2454

13. As per claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses said access control manager program spawns said linking program based on a said first request program (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

14. As per claim 11, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses said software application is a database application (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

15. As per claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

16. As per claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses allowing said one version to process said information from said request and formulate a response responsive thereto, and returning said response to said user (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

17. As per claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 14, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses said returning step comprises: passing said response to a communications program and communicating by said communications

Art Unit: 2454

program information from said response to said user (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

18. As per claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 14, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses spawning (instances, 40, fig 2)an independent communications process for handling communications between said site and said user (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 20).

19. As per claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 14, above. In addition, Ciarlante discloses sending information identifying said user as having been connected to said one site to an auxiliary program (10, fig 1, col 4, lines 39-64; col 8, line 42 – col 9, line 2).

20. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciarlante and Nishiyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bryan et al. (6,591,418) (hereinafter Brayn).

21. As per claim 2, Ciarlante and Nishiyama do not disclose said table is a registry in a Microsoft Windows operating system. However, storing configuration in registry is well known in the art. Bryan discloses table is a registry in a Microsoft Windows operating system (col 7, lines 42-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nishiyama and

Ahmad with Bryan. The motivation would have been using NT registry to store the configuration data.

22. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciarlante and Nishiyama as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mutschler et al. (5,974,430) (hereinafter Mutschler).

23. As per claim 12, Ciarlante and Nishiyama fails to disclose said software application is the program called MAPPER available Unisys. However, Mutschler discloses said software application is the program called MAPPER substantially as presently available Unisys (col 6, lines 12-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ciarlante and Nishiyama with Mutschler. The motivation would have been using Unisys Mapper (database) product.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 09/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 1-18 is maintained.

25. In general, Applicant's arguments reflect a difference of opinion over the teachings of the prior art and how these teachings would be evaluated in light of the knowledge generally available to those in the appropriate art and the level of ordinary skill in the art. Moreover, Applicant's take an overly narrow view of the claim language. The Examiner takes note the above Applicant's remark; however, Applicant's remark could not be imported into the claim. Therefore, the Examiner could not consider Applicant's remark.

26. In response to Applicant's arguments **against the references individually**, one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case Ciarlante discloses a table (10, fig 1) on said server (10, fig 1) containing correspondences between ones of a plurality of sites and ones of said SiteID codes (12, fig 1) said correspondences logically connecting a one of said more than one version of a said software application program to a one of said plurality of sites (12, fig 1) indicated by said SiteID code (url, col 8, line 42 - col 9, line 20), wherein said one of said plurality of sites has only one of said more than one version of a said software application program and at least one data area (elements of Fig 1, col 8, line 42 - col 9, line 20). Nishiyama shows a system a system maintenance and management of different version of the same application, and also provide details of site management functions with table containing SiteID (fig 3 and fig 14, col 7, line 42 to col 8, line 52). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the detailed teachings of site management of Nishiyama into the software application hosting system taught by Ciarlante to provide access to different copies of software application over a wide area network.

Conclusion

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMMAD A. SIDDIQI whose telephone number is (571)272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2454

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454